



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/606,243	06/26/2003	Tetsuo Hasegawa	04329.3080	4233
22852	7590	12/02/2005	EXAMINER	
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			HARPER, LEON JONATHAN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2166	

DATE MAILED: 12/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/606,243	Applicant(s) HASEGAWA ET AL.	
	Examiner Leon J. Harper	Art Unit 2166	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 June 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 6/26/2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the application 10606243 filed on 6/26/2003.

Claims 1-15 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-3,6-8,11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US 2003 0065774 (hereinafter Steiner).

2. As for claim 1, Steiner discloses: a temporary search unit configured to, when receiving from an agent a search request to search for a desired information service from a plurality of information services existing on a network, search a registry in which said plurality of information services are registered in such a manner that said plurality of information services correspond to information items and item values corresponding to the contents of each service (See paragraph [0027] and table 1); and search condition item extracting means for extracting at least one of an information item related to the information service retrieved by the temporary search unit and a value of the information item, from the registry and notifying the agent of at least of the information item extracted and the value extracted, together with the result of the search made by the temporary search unit (See paragraph 0039 note: that the broker is the agent).

As for claim 2, Steiner discloses: wherein the search apparatus condition item extracting means classifies, common category, the information item names and/or item

Art Unit: 2166

values related to the information service retrieved by the temporary search unit and notifies the agent of the result (See paragraph 0041 note that the information is being cached).

As for claim 3, the rejection of claim 2 is incorporated, and further Steiner discloses: wherein the search condition item extracting means uses ontology trees to classify, by common category, the information item names and/or item values related to the information service retrieved by the temporary search unit (See table 3 and paragraph 0088 note that Resource Description is a category name and List of resources has properties of each resources).

3. Claims 6-8 are information service support claims corresponding to information service search support claims 1-3 respectively, and are thus rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1-3.

Claims 11-13 are information service search method claims corresponding to information service search support claims 1-3 respectively, and are thus rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1-3.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 4,5,9,10,14,15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Steiner as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of US 6327590 (hereinafter Chidlovskii).

4. As for claim 4, the rejection of claim 2 is incorporated, and further Steiner differs from the claimed invention in that Steiner does not explicitly disclose: wherein the search condition item extracting means classifies, by the frequency of appearance, the information item names and/or item values classified by category and notifies the agent

Art Unit: 2166

of the result. Chidlovskii however does disclose the search condition item extracting means classifies, by the frequency of appearance, the information item names and/or item values classified by category and notifies the agent of the result (See column 1 lines 41-44). It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated and teaching of Chidlovskii into the system of Steiner. The modification would have been obvious because the more an information item name appears; the assumption is the more vital that item is to the operations of the provider.

As for claim 5, the rejection of claim 4 is incorporated, and further Steiner differs from the claimed invention in that the search condition item extracting means determines the qualification as a search condition item of each of the information item names and/or item values classified by the frequency of appearance for a search condition, on the basis of its frequency of appearance and notifies the agent of the result is not explicitly indicated. Chidlovskii however does disclose: wherein the search condition item extracting means determines the qualification as a search condition item of each of the information item names and/or item values classified by the frequency of appearance for a search condition, on the basis of its frequency of appearance and notifies the agent of the result (See column 9 lines 46-51). It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the pertinent art to have incorporated the teaching of Chidlovskii into the system of Steiner. The modification would have been obvious

Art Unit: 2166

because the more an information item name appears; the assumption is the more vital that item is to the operations of the provider.

Claims 9 and 10 are information service support claims corresponding to information service search support claims 4 and 5 respectively, and are thus rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 4 and 5.

Claims 14 and 15 are information service search method claims corresponding to information service search support claims 4 and 5 respectively, and are thus rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 4 and 5.

Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leon J. Harper whose telephone number is 571-272-0759. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30AM - 4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain T. Alam can be reached on 571-272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2166

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LJH
Leon Harper
November 28, 2005


HOSAIN ALAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER